

**WEST VALLEY CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**February 12, 2014**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chairman Phil Conder at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

**WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Harold Woodruff, Brent Fuller, Jack Matheson, Terri Mills, Phil Conder, Barbara Thomas, and Clover Meaders

**ABSENT**

N/A

**WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF**

Steve Pastorik, Kevin Despain, Jody Knapp, and Nichole Camac

**AUDIENCE**

Approximately eight (8) people were in the audience

## **ZONE TEXT CHANGE APPLICATION**

### **ZT-10-2013**

#### **West Valley City**

#### **Amending Section 7-14-105 regarding single family home design standards**

This application was continued during the Planning Commission meeting on January 15<sup>th</sup> to allow staff time to solicit input from homebuilders.

City staff is proposing a zoning ordinance amendment to Section 7-14-105 which addresses single family home design standards. The primary changes are to the point system of architectural features that were first adopted in 2005. The City Council has requested an update to the point system to raise the bar on the standards and to adjust the point value of different features so that the more prominent items are emphasized.

By way of background, the outline below describes the progression of the City's single family home standards:

#### Prior to 1998

- Minimum house size: 900 sq. ft.
- Single car garage or basement storage required

#### 1998

- Minimum house size: 1,200 sq. ft.
- Two car garage required
- Started to use development agreements for planned unit developments (PUD's)

#### 2002

- Minimum house size: 1,350 sq. ft. for ramblers and 1,500 sq. ft. for multi-levels
- 35% masonry required
- Required development agreements for all rezones and PUD's

#### 2005

- Point system for architectural features added

#### 2006

- Minimum house size: 1,400 sq. ft. for ramblers and 1,600 sq. ft. for multi-levels

The proposed ordinance revisions are attached to this report. The main changes are an increase in the minimum number of points required and a decrease in the point value of many of the architectural features. Below is a brief explanation for most of the changes:

- The minimum roof pitch was increased to 4:12. Most homes built today have pitches at 6:12 and staff believes the current 2'5":12 standard is too low.
- To prevent the garage door from being the dominant feature on the front of the house, a standard was added that requires the non-garage portion of the house to be at least 20' wide.
- To raise the bar on architectural features, the minimum number of points was raised to 240 for ramblers and 300 for multi-levels.
- To gain a greater variety of features used, a new category for windows was added.
- For most items, the point value was reduced to raise the bar on the standards and to emphasize features that are more prominent than others.
- The use of two or more gables was separated from the hip style roof or two or more planes as these are different treatments that each add roof articulation.
- For the material selections, the 50%, 80% and 100% brick options were removed as they were rarely if ever used even though they had high point values. They were replaced with exterior material options that are much more likely to be used based on a review of recent home plans.
- The minimum size of columns for covered entries was increased to make them stand out more.

- The separation between the third car garage and the rest of the garage was reduced slightly to match what was seen on several recent home plans.
- For certain window treatments, a small amount of points was allotted to each treatment and a cap was introduced. For example, instead of getting 40 points for using 5 or more windows, a builder can get 5 points for each window. The idea here is that there should be some credit given for windows if less than 5 are used.
- Three new items were added to offer builders more choices and reflect features used on recent home plans.
- Gable returns were moved to the seventh category of additional design selections since these features were not considered substantial enough by themselves to be counted as the one required roof treatment.
- The amount of additional square footage eligible for points was reduced since this is one of the more costly items.

Also attached to this report is a PowerPoint presentation that includes 11 home plans. The first six plans are plans that would pass under the proposed ordinance. The last five plans would not pass under the proposed ordinance.

If the proposed new standards are adopted, they will only apply to homes in new subdivisions that are submitted after the ordinance is adopted. There are still hundreds of lots within approved subdivisions like Highbury Place, Southridge and Sunset Hills that will not be affected by these new standards.

Following the Planning Commission meeting on January 15, staff sent a letter along with a copy of the proposed ordinance to seven homebuilders. Staff received comments from Randy Moore with Moore Homes. Attached to this report is a list of Mr. Moore's comments as well as staff's response to the comments. The highlighted responses reflect those that resulted in a minor change to the proposed ordinance.

During the study session on February 5<sup>th</sup>, the Commission discussed a couple of additional changes. The first was to add railing to the front stairs as an item that would receive points. This change is included in the attached draft. The second was to add a semi-enclosed patio to the front of the home. There did not appear to be consensus on this item; therefore, this feature was not added.

### **Staff Alternatives**

1. Approval, the standards should be modified.
2. Continuance, for reasons determined during the public hearing.
3. Denial, the ordinance should remain unchanged.

**Applicant:**

West Valley City

**Neutral:**

Randy Moore  
9691 Granite Woods Cir.

**Neutral:**

Russ Tolbert  
8608 Cima Dr.

**Neutral:**

Dennis Berrett

**Discussion:** Steve Pastorik presented the application. Jack Matheson asked if there are points provided for landscaping. Steve replied that landscaping is required by ordinance in the front yard but is not included in this ordinance. Terri Mills stated that 5 points for each window are given up to a maximum of 40 for homes and asked if each window in a garage is also given that same amount. Steve replied that garage windows are counted as one and given 10 points. Commissioner Mills asked if headers for windows are addressed and given points. Steve replied that points are given for grid patterns, shutters, etc. but headers are not listed as a bonus feature.

Randy Moore, a developer, stated that the market is still in a difficult position and this should be taken into account. He asked if landscaping changes have been made. Steve replied no. Mr. Moore stated that styles and trends change over time and giving point values for outdated styles may be

detrimental to the City. Mr. Moore discussed various changes that he would like reconsidered (these were provided to the Planning Commission prior to the hearing as well and are included in the packet). He discussed cantilevered living areas, more points for all stucco homes, tapered brick columns, more points for 3 car garages, no points for non-rectangular windows, more points for more windows, siding applied horizontally and vertically should be given significantly more points due to cost, and re-adding points for decorative vents. Jack Matheson asked if there is air movement for the decorative vents. Mr. Moore replied that it isn't needed but is used often. Mr. Moore stated that lowering point values and increasing the amount of points required can help but added that developers must work off this list. He indicated that this can eventually cause more uniformity and remove variety from homes being built within the City. Mr. Moore also indicated that home buyers often don't want features added to their homes but are required to by the City to ensure the home meets the minimum number of points. Commissioner Matheson stated that one option that should be included and addressed is lighting. He added that installing a sprinkler system may also be a good option to add. Mr. Moore stated that many homeowners like to do their own landscaping. He indicated that the financial side of things needs to be addressed. He indicated that nicer homes on the outside might cause a decrease of quality inside because developers cannot afford to do otherwise. He stated that he understands the City wants to increase the standard for homes being built but added that the money isn't there for a lot of developers in today's market. Phil Conder asked if points were matched to financial cost in any way. Steve replied that cost was considered but wasn't the only factor. He indicated that garage versus porch are different costs but similar points due to the impact of the appearance of the home. He added that that fencing, sprinklers, etc. are difficult to enforce with this ordinance since this is primarily tied to a building permit. Mr. Moore stated that bigger homes should be given more points.

Russ Tolbert, a developer, stated that he agreed with many of the points discussed by Mr. Moore. He stated that he understands what is trying to be accomplished but the average income can't accommodate these changes. Mr. Tolbert stated that he feels 6 inch fascia's should still be included as an option along with a hip style roof. He also indicated that a 20 foot home width (not garage) is difficult to accommodate on smaller lots and added that there is a popular home design he sells that won't meet this ordinance requirement. Commissioner Matheson stated that this is done so that the garage doesn't dominate the home. Mr. Tolbert stated that there are many designs that this isn't a problem with and added that this is a difficult requirement for two story homes as well. Mr. Tolbert stated that the value of various items in the ordinance in correlation to cost need to be more closely evaluated.

Phil Conder asked what percentage of builders come in with a development agreement versus those that come in utilizing the point system. Steve replied that he would estimate about 1/3.

Dennis Berrett stated he agreed with the previous developers. He indicated that there is a challenge with appraisals and a challenge in meeting the City ordinances. He stated that points don't often value the cost and indicated that it is important that they do. He stated that more points should be given for bigger homes. Mr. Berrett stated that people prefer larger homes and often don't want to add things to the outside. He indicated there is a balancing act that must be worked out.

Mr. Moore stated that he doesn't like that gable returns were removed. Steve stated that they are still included but have been moved to a different section.

**Motion:** Commissioner Matheson moved for continuance to address concerns discussed by the developers and the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

**Roll call vote:**

Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Meaders	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Commissioner Woodruff	Yes
Chairman Conder	Yes

**Unanimous-ZT-10-2013- Continued**

**ZT-1-2014**

**West Valley City**

**Amending Section 7-1-103 and adding Section 7-2-132 regarding household pets**

The City Council has asked staff to prepare an ordinance amendment to address household pets. Specifically, the Council wanted to allow chickens as household pets and to redefine the term “household pets” so that it is very clear which animals are allowed. The attached ordinance accomplishes both changes. To clarify, allowing chickens as household pets would mean that they are allowed in residential zones.

Currently, chickens are only allowed in agricultural zones. Animal Control already receives about 15 to 20 complaints per week regarding:

- failure to maintain control of noise and smell,
- inadequate accommodations and
- alleged commercial enterprise (meat/eggs).

While the City could technically address noise, smell and commercial use issues via other ordinances, staff is concerned that the potential volume of complaints could be beyond the City’s ability to address at current staffing levels if the ordinance is amended to allow chickens as household pets.

On the definition of household pets, staff researched other cities and found that they also have definitions that are fairly general in nature as opposed to the very specific definition that is proposed. Animal Control has found that the current definition is effective at addressing issues that arise.

**Staff Alternatives**

1. Denial, the ordinance should remain unchanged.
2. Continuance, for reasons determined during the public hearing.
3. Approval, the ordinance should be changed as proposed.

**Applicant:**

West Valley City

**Discussion:** Steve Pastorik presented the application. Phil Conder stated that he is okay with chickens. He indicated he doesn’t see the difference between chickens and other animals and the impact they cause on neighborhoods. Terri Mills stated that she raises chickens and has experience with an agricultural lot. She indicated that the nature of feeding chickens in itself attracts rodents. She stated that chickens are also preyed on by raccoons and traps must be set to deter this. Commissioner Mills added that neighboring dogs will also chase and either harm or kill chickens and there will also be a significant increase in the amount of barking within the neighborhood. She indicated that she believes there will be a significant increase in calls for animal control. Commissioner Mills stated that there is a point system on ‘A’ lots that limits the amount of animals allowed and to allow more of these in residential areas doesn’t correlate. She stated that there will be significant problems created

especially on many small lots throughout the City. Commissioner Conder asked if there are any spacing requirements. Steve replied no and stated that there will be no regulations on coops. He also added that, in staff's opinion, it would become a burden on animal control due to the difficulty in enforcing the number of chickens allowed, the potential commercial selling of chickens, etc. Brent Fuller stated that he doesn't think anyone would sell eggs with just 4 chickens. Jack Matheson stated that he believes people will want more than just 4 chickens. Harold Woodruff stated that he neighbors an 'A' lot and has had many problems with chickens including smell and chickens entering his yard. He stated that it does become a nuisance. Barbara Thomas agreed and stated that the smell has been a concern to her as well. Clover Meaders stated that birds are allowed in the ordinance and questioned why chickens are not included in this definition. Brandon Hill indicated that no one has argued this point and chickens have always been addressed separately. Phil Conder stated that all these concerns seem to be circumstances where there are too many chickens. He indicated that the ordinance will only allow a maximum of 4 with no other pets. He stated that dogs or other pets can have just as many problems and concerns as chickens but they are allowed. Brent Fuller agreed. He stated that noise isn't a concern since roosters aren't allowed and added that dogs can be just as frustrating.

**Motion:** Commissioner Thomas moved for denial.

Commissioner Meaders seconded the motion.

**Roll call vote:**

Commissioner Fuller	No
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Meaders	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Commissioner Woodruff	Yes
Chairman Conder	No

**Majority-ZT-1-2014- Denied**

**CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATIONS**

**C-60-2013**

**Barney Trucking**

**6381 W 2100 S**

**Approved use: Truck Transfer Terminal**

**M zone, 7.2 acres**

***This application was continued from the January 9, 2014 public hearing at the applicant's request in order to petition a variance with the Board of Adjustments prior to Planning Commission review.***

This site is located at 6381 W 2100 S. The subject property is zoned 'M', manufacturing, on 7.2 acres. 'Truck Transfer' is a conditional use in the 'M' zone. The surrounding businesses are all manufacturing, many of which are trucking businesses. The General Plan calls for light manufacturing.

Barney Trucking is a large dry-bulk commodity hauler looking to expand their business to Northern Utah. They currently operate out of Salina, UT. This site will operate as a terminal for trucks to serve regional customers in Utah and the West. One of their largest customers is Kennecott. The type of equipment that they use is very large freight trucks that do not have the ability to back up as conventional semi trucks can.

On February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014, the West Valley Board of Adjustments granted this property a variance. The parameters and approvals of the variance are discussed below.

### **Site Issues**

The primary issue for this property is the absence of curbing and access driveways. This site has been discussed at length with West Valley City staff to devise a plan that will both satisfy city ordinances to the extent possible while allowing Barney Trucking functionality. They hope to utilize the site in that their trucks can make the turn to enter the site, navigate to the weigh scale and also to the parking stalls, and exit the site.

The Board of Adjustments granted a variance to the site for two requests. The first request granted the access driveways additional width on the center and west side accesses to 89' and 79' respectively. The second request waived the requirement that a 20' wide landscape buffer be installed on the west side. The west access point also provides access to the rear building.

The West Valley City parking ordinance allows the City Engineer the ability to modify the maximum number of access driveways. The City Engineer has approved the site to incorporate three drive accesses.

The south end has a large undeveloped area. This area must not be used unless it is surfaced as approved by the City. Barney Trucking is aware of this requirement and has no plans to occupy that area for now.

### **Structures**

Barney Trucking will use the building closest to the frontage road as its primary base of operations. It is approximately 7,500 square feet. Currently, no modifications will be made to the building but it is anticipated to be remodeled in the future. At that point, this site will return to the Planning Commission. They will remove the two canopies on the building. The structure in the rear, which is 8,400 square feet, may serve as office space for other businesses. It has been used primarily as office space but at the time of this hearing it is mostly vacant. No use in the building currently requires conditional use approval.

### **Landscaping**

The 201 frontage road, 2100 S, is a high-image arterial. If \$50,000 worth of improvements are made, then the requirements of section 7-13 'Landscaping along High Image Arterials' would be required. Since Barney Trucking intends to renovate the building up front in the future, they opted to make those improvements as part of this phase of the approval process. Section 7-13 requires the installment of a 20 foot landscape buffer with a 1:4 sloped berm. Trees will be planted at a minimum of one per 600 square feet of the gross area of the landscape buffer. Trees will be selected from the approved trees list as outlined in ordinance.

The applicant will also be required to bring all existing landscaped areas into compliance.

During the Planning Commission study session, it was recommended that since the variance granted the site wider drive widths, that the landscaping that was removed be replaced elsewhere on the site. This amounts to 1,180 square feet of landscaping. This could be made up by widening the landscape buffers.

### **Parking**

Barney Trucking is proposing 41 stalls for the building in front and 35 stalls in the rear. The front building if used as office space would require 30 stalls and the building in the rear if used as office space would require 33 stalls. They also have a total of 20 large truck parking stalls. Barney Trucking does not intend to park more than 20 trucks.

### **Signage**

The applicant is not proposing new signage at this time. They will be removing the abandoned pole sign out front. There is a billboard in the center of the property which will not be removed.

## **Staff Alternatives**

**Approval**, subject to the following condition:

1. The site shall be improved as per final approved plans.
2. The abandoned pole sign and the two canopies shall be removed.
3. Landscaping along 2100 S, as per the approved site plan, shall comply with the standards of section 7-13, 'Landscaping for High Image Arterials.'
4. Additional landscaping shall be included in the landscaping along 2100 S to replace the landscaping that was waived by the Board of Adjustments as part of the variance.
5. Existing landscape areas shall be restored to 50% live plant material. Landscaping shall be provided throughout the parking areas as per the parking ordinance landscape requirements.
6. The undeveloped area on the south side shall not be used unless approved and surfaced according to city standards.
7. If refuse dumpsters are requested, then they shall be screened by a 6 ' masonry enclosure with gate.
8. All other provisions of the West Valley City Code shall be met.
9. All requirements of affected departments and agencies shall be met, including and not limited to West Valley City Public Works.

**Continuance**, to allow for the resolutions of any issues raised at the public hearing.

**Applicant:**

Steve Hansen

3223 Hunters Moon Place

**Applicant:**

Tyler Barney

528 E Rose Bowl Court

**Discussion:** Kevin Despain presented the application. Barbara Thomas asked where the pole sign currently sits. Kevin indicated the location on the map. She clarified that this will be removed. Kevin replied yes.

Steve Hansen, representing the applicant, stated that he did traffic flow evaluations on the site and tried to meet City ordinances while ensuring that the site could function adequately for Barney Trucking. He stated that the company uses large trucks that carry dry bulk and these trucks lack the ability to reverse which effects the way the site must be developed. Mr. Hansen stated that variances were requested and approved by the Board of Adjustment to accommodate the existing scales and necessary traffic flow on the site. Mr. Hansen stated that the ordinance requires 5% landscaping which the site does meet so the applicant feels additional landscaping shouldn't be required. He stated that there is an access easement on the west side of the property to the rear building and also a perpetual easement to the billboard. Jack Matheson asked if the overlay of the asphalt on the site was done to accommodate heavy trucks. Mr. Hansen replied most likely but he is unsure. Jack clarified that the only striping that will be done is the diagonal truck parking. Mr. Hansen replied yes.

Tyler Barney, the applicant, stated that the challenges on the site have been addressed. He indicated that the perpetual easement to the billboard was put in place by the previous property owner so it cannot be removed. He indicated that the site is designed specifically the way it is to ensure easy access, good traffic flow, and safety. Commissioner Matheson asked if every truck is weighed. Mr. Barney stated that most trucks must be weighed at the site and then again at the job site to ensure no material was lost. Commissioner Matheson asked if new scales will be installed or if the applicant will be utilizing the existing scales. Mr. Barney replied the existing scales will remain. Commissioner Thomas stated that she understands the need to eliminate landscaping on the west and center due to the variance granting wider driveways but added that the landscaping lost could be installed



elsewhere on the site. She stated that she would prefer additional landscaping to be added next to the building in place of a couple parking stalls. Mr. Hansen stated that there are plans to grow and expand the site in the future and this may interfere with that. Commissioner Mills stated that she believes adding additional landscaping would be reasonable especially due to the size of the site. She indicated that a little more landscaping could help the street view appearance. Clover Meaders stated that she doesn't feel more landscaping than required by the ordinance is necessary and added that this is in the manufacturing zone. Commissioner Mills stated that it isn't much to add and indicated the England Trucking, also in West Valley, has a nice landscaped property in the manufacturing zone. Commissioner Matheson stated that he doesn't feel additional landscaping is needed and the landscaping provided is adequate for the site and the use.

**Motion:** Commissioner Fuller moved for approval subject to conditions 1-3 and 5-9.

Commissioner Meaders seconded the motion.

**Roll call vote:**

Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Meaders	Yes
Commissioner Mills	No
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Commissioner Woodruff	Yes
Chairman Conder	Yes

**Majority-C-60-2013- Approved**

**C-2-2014**

**TitleMax**

**1754 West 3500 South**

**Car Title Loan Service**

**C-2 zone, 0.47 acres**

The applicant, TitleMax, is requesting a conditional use for a car title loan service at 1754 West 3500 South. The General Plan designates this property as Mixed Use. The surrounding zone is C-2 and the surrounding uses include retail and restaurant uses.

TitleMax would like to operate a car title loan service at this location. They will not offer any deferred deposit or check cashing services. This site will not contain any outside storage and any vehicles that need to be repossessed will be handled by a third-party company off site. There will be three to four employees that operate from this location and the hours of operation are 9am – 7pm Monday – Friday, 10am – 4pm Saturday and they will be closed on Sundays.

This is an existing site and the building was constructed in 1972. It has historically been used as a billiards hall and then a bar and grill. The last tenant that occupied the site was Time Out Sports and their license was terminated in 2011.

The applicant proposes to remodel the interior of the building to create an office type atmosphere. The exterior of the building will be modified slightly which will include removal of the vinyl panels along the south and west façade. Those panels will then be replaced with stucco and several large windows. The remaining portions of the building will be painted white. The estimated construction costs of the building modifications total over \$50,000. Therefore, the requirements set forth in the Landscaping on Major Arterials (7-13) would be applicable. The current building setback from the right-of-way is approximately 26'. Therefore the full 30' improvement width can not be accomplished. The applicant is proposing a 14'

park strip, a 10' sidewalk and a 2' landscaped area in front of the building that will then be expanded on the opposite side of the drive aisle.

The overall site is also required to have landscaping per the Commercial Zone standards set forth in the City Code. The percentage required is reduced due to the streetscape standards, therefore, the site is required to have 13.5% landscaping. The applicant has proposed to provide this landscaping throughout the parking area on site. This landscaping will be required to meet the standards set forth in the parking chapter (7-9) of the West Valley City Code. These standards include one tree per 300 square feet of gross landscaped area, which would be 10 trees. Also, areas that are less than 8' in width can not contain sod.

The parking for this use is calculated at 1 space for every 250 square feet of gross floor area (3,956). Therefore, the minimum required parking for this site is 16 spaces and 26 stalls have been provided.

The applicant has proposed a wall sign and monument sign for this business. The wall sign will be permitted to occupy 15% of the front building face and 5% of the sides. The applicant has proposed an awning along the south and west façade with a 16'2" x 4'4" graphic, which meets the ordinance criteria. A 6' tall monument sign has also been proposed to be located on site and will also meet all requirements set forth in the Sign Code.

### **Staff Alternatives**

Approval subject to any issues raised at the public hearing as well as the following conditions:

1. The site shall only be used for car title loans. No check cashing or deferred deposit uses are allowed.
2. No outside storage of any kind is permitted on site, including but not limited to any repossessed vehicles.
3. The frontage shall be designed in accordance with the Landscaping on High Image Arterials per the approved site plan with a 14' park strip, 10' sidewalk and 2' landscaped area adjacent to the building.
4. Sufficient landscaping shall be installed throughout the site to comply with the requirement that 13.5% of the site be landscaped.
5. Landscaping provided throughout the parking area shall comply with Chapter 7-9 of the West Valley City Code.
6. Signage shall be designed in accordance with the West Valley City Sign Ordinance.
7. The Planning Commission may review this application upon receipt of valid unresolved complaints.
8. All requirements of affected departments and agencies must be met including but not limited to West Valley City Public Works and the Utah Department of Transportation..

**Continuance**, to allow for the resolutions of any issues raised at the public hearing.

### **Applicant:**

Cristina Coronado  
201 S Main

**Discussion:** Jody Knapp presented the application. Terri Mills asked why there is a chain link fence with slats next to the building. Jody replied that it isn't required but was there with the previous business.

Cristina Coronado, representing the applicant, stated that this piece of property is part of an existing larger development. She stated that TitleMax will be occupying this parcel and will update landscaping standards to meet the ordinance. Phil Conder stated that none of the Planning Commission members like the painted white color of the building. Terri Mills displayed a picture of an existing TitleMax that utilizes different colors and material. Ms. Coronado replied that the white building is the standard in Utah. Commissioner Mills asked if the fence screens anything. Ms. Coronado replied that she isn't sure if it will be used but indicated that it was part of the previous business and will remain for this one. Barbara Thomas asked what the width of the landscaping will be next to the building. Jody replied 2 feet. Barbara Thomas asked if there is vehicular access to the far west on the north end of the property. Ms. Coronado replied no. Commissioner Thomas asked how traffic will flow on the site. Jody indicated that customers will be able to enter off 3500 S and either loop around to the neighboring property back to 3500 S or go north and then east to exit. Commissioner Mills asked if there are shared access agreements. Jody replied yes and indicated that there is one property owner for the development but there are agreements in place for shared parking and access.

**Motion:** Commissioner Fuller moved for approval subject to the 8 staff conditions.

Commissioner Woodruff seconded the motion.

**Roll call vote:**

Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Meaders	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Yes
Commissioner Thomas	Yes
Commissioner Woodruff	Yes
Chairman Conder	Yes

**Unanimous-C-2-2014- Approved**

**PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS**

Approval of Minutes from November 6, 2013 (Study Session) **Approved**

Approval of Minutes from January 29, 2014 (Regular Meeting) **Approved**

Approval of Minutes from February 5, 2014 (Study Session) **Approved**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nichole Camac, Administrative Assistant